

Applicant : Lee et al.
Serial No. : 09/712,855
Filed : November 14, 2000
Page : 14 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 09595-004002

REMARKS

Claims 2-33 were pending. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, and 19 stand rejected. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, and 23-33 are allowed. Claims 6-8, 13-15, and 20-22 are objected to. The applicant amended claims 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21, and 22. The applicant canceled claims 6, 13, and 20 without prejudice. Claims 2-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21-33 are now pending, of which claims 2-4, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30 and 32-33 are independent claims. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and following remarks.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification because the claim of priority did not specify status of the priority application. The applicant amended the specification to indicate status as required by the Examiner.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 2-22 stand rejected under the judicially create doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,859. The applicant submits with the present response a terminal disclaimer, which obviates the judicially created double patenting rejection.

Section 102 Rejections

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,687 to Griffith ("Griffith"). The applicant amended claim 4 to include limitations of claim 6, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. (The applicant canceled claim 6.) For at least the reason that claim 6 is allowable, claim 4 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Griffith. The applicant amended claim 11 to include limitations of claim 13, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. (The applicant canceled claim 13.) For at least the

Applicant : Lee et al.
Serial No. : 09/712,855
Filed : November 14, 2000
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 09595-004002

reason that claim 13 is allowable, claim 11 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Griffith. The applicant amended claim 18 to include limitations of claim 20, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims. (The applicant canceled claim 20.) For at least the reason that claim 20 is allowable, claim 18 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.


Claim Amendments

The applicant amended claims 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, and 22 so that they do not depend from a canceled claim and/or for clarification.

Please apply \$120 for the one-month extension of time and any other appropriate charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2005



Tim H. Pham
Reg. No. 48,589

Customer No. 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50264695.doc